

(c) REMARKS

The claims are 1-19 with claims 1, 18 and 19 being independent. The claims have been amended to clarify a formal matter unrelated to patentability.

Reconsideration of the claims is expressly requested.

The Examiner had objected to claims 1-19 under Rule 112, second paragraph, on the ground that broad ratios for the polyfluoroolefin unit and the alkylene oxide units should be recited, since if no polyfluoroolefin unit or alkylene oxide unit is present, adverse results are obtained.

Accordingly, in order to expedite prosecution and without admitting the propriety of the objection, claims 1, 18 and 19 have been amended to provide a broad ratio of polyolefin unit to alkylene oxide unit, as disclosed on page 15, lines 2-5. Clearly, the claim is intended to cover all effective ratios of polyfluoroolefin units to alkylene oxide units, whether or not explicitly recited on specification page 15.

Accordingly, it is submitted that the objection, having been overcome, should be withdrawn. Since there is no prior art rejection, it is submitted that the claims should now be allowed and that the case should be passed to issue.

Applicants' undersigned attorney may be reached in our New York office by telephone at (212) 218-2100. All correspondence should continue to be directed to our below listed address.

Respectfully submitted,



Peter Saxon
Attorney for Applicants
Registration No. 24,947

FITZPATRICK, CELLA, HARPER & SCINTO
30 Rockefeller Plaza
New York, New York 10112-3801
Facsimile: (212) 218-2200
NY_539865v1